

**Remarks/Arguments:**


All of the originally presented claims 1 through 21 have been cancelled. Consideration and allowance of newly presented claims 22 through 28 are respectfully requested.

All of the newly presented claims call for the inclusion of the very important aspect of applicant's invention that involves a third party in the potential management of an occupant of a physical area during an emergency evacuation. U.S. Published Application 2003/0069002 to Hunter et al., applied in the rejection of the originally presented claims, neither discloses nor suggests involvement of an emergency responder, or a facility administrator, or another occupant (e.g., a co-worker) or other third party in evacuating an occupant from a hazardous area. Support for the inclusion of a third party in the potential management of an occupant of a physical area during an emergency evacuation is found, for example, in paragraphs [0064], [0065], [0085], and [0111] of applicant's published application.

The inclusion of a third party in the potential evacuation management of an occupant of a physical area during an emergency provides safeguards against, for example, (1) a failure in the direct communications link between the occupant, who is at risk, and the system in which a personalized evacuation route for this occupant is stored, and (2) the personalized evacuation route stored for the occupant is no longer valid because the physical conditions of the personalized evacuation route or the physical area where the occupant is located have changed such that an alternative evacuation route must be developed and communicated to the occupant.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Andrew L. Ney Reg. No. 20,300  
Attorney for Applicant

Dated: October 1, 2008

4 Andorra Hill Road  
Lafayette Hill, PA 19444  
(610) 828-5332